

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Revise and Clarify Commission Regulations Relating to the Safety of Electric Utility and Communications Infrastructure Provider Facilities.

Rulemaking No. 08-11-005
(Filed November 6, 2008)

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 14-01-010

Claimant: Mussey Grade Road Alliance (MGRA)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 14-01-010
Claimed: \$27,902.67	Awarded: \$28,080.17
Assigned Commissioner: Florio	Assigned ALJ: Kenney

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief Description of Decision:	Decision to initiate first phase of statewide utility fire hazard map creation.
--	---

B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	No PHC	Verified
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	2/19/2009	Verified
3. Date NOI Filed:	2/18/2009	2/19/2009
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.08-11-005	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	3/16/2009	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	NA	
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.08-11-005	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	3/16/2009	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	NA	
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-01-010	Verified
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	1/22/2014	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	3/19/2014	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
1	X		Line 1. While there was a PHC in this phase of the process, the determination of MGRA eligibility for intervenor compensation in this proceeding was made during the initial phase of this project in accordance with rules specific to this proceeding, as acknowledged in the ALJ ruling of March 16, 2009.
2		X	Scoping Ruling of January 6, 2009 specified February 19, 2009 as the deadline to submit an NOI for this proceeding.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. In the fields below, describe in a concise manner Claimant's contribution to the final decision (*see* § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059).

Contribution	Specific References to Claimant's Presentations and to Decision	Showing Accepted by CPUC
<p>Note: For definition of contribution types, see Comment 2 in Section C. For definition of issue, see Comment 1 in Section C. For reference abbreviations, see Comment 3 in Section C</p>		
<p>1. Opposed use of LLNL (Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory) to produce work plan and/or maps.</p> <p>Contributor Issue: Map</p>	<p>MGRA-1204-PHC, p. 2 -“The decision should not be modified to include LLNL”</p> <p>CPUC-1305-Scp, p. 5: “no formal steps have been taken thus far to contract with LLNL.”</p> <p>Id. p. 7: “This Amended Scoping Memo establishes a self-directed Technical Panel for Track 3 where the parties will prepare a detailed work plan for (1) the funding, development, expert review, adoption, and implementation of fire-threat maps...”</p>	Yes
<p>2. Opposed the inclusion of biomass in utility fire maps.</p> <p>Contributor Issue: Map</p>	<p>MGRA-1204-PHC, p. 5- “The Alliance believes that expanding the scope of the mapping project to ‘identify areas on a statewide basis where vegetation biomass should be removed for fire safety purposes would be a mistake at several levels.”</p> <p>D.14-01-010 provides no provision for biomass identification.</p>	Yes
<p>3. MGRA was the first to propose dividing mapping into two phases: the production of a science-based/agnostic map</p>	<p>Joint-1304-PHC, p. 4 – “Broadly speaking, the development of the fire threat maps would consist of two phases. The first phase consists of</p>	

<p>followed by a regulatory map for application to utility-specific issues. MGRA obtained buy-in of this approach by Cal Fire and SED, and filed jointly with SED.</p> <p>Initiator Issue: Map</p>	<p>developing an “agnostic” map, which accurately identifies areas where there is an elevated probability of catastrophic power-line fires occurring.”</p> <p>D.14-01-010, p. 10 – “The goal of the first step is to develop and adopt a scientifically based fire-threat map that depicts the physical and environmental conditions associated with an elevated potential for utility-associated wildfires (hereafter, ‘Fire Map 1’).”</p>	Yes
<p>4. MGRA supported the idea of funding external experts for the purpose of creating scientifically accurate fire hazard maps.</p> <p>Contributor Issue: Map</p>	<p>Joint-1304-PHC, pp. 4-5: “It is essential that technically capable representatives of the Commission and/or other parties be involved in the creation of the statewide fire threat maps, along with any technical experts provided by the utilities. A mechanism must be determined to fund the hiring of such experts.”</p> <p>D.14-01-010, p. 11: “Three investor-owned electric utilities (IOUs) - PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E -have volunteered to pay for the external experts and resources deemed necessary by Cal Fire.”</p>	Yes
<p>5. MGRA collaboratively participated with all parties in the creation of the work plan adopted by the Commission, including input, revisions, drafts and workshop participation.</p> <p>Contributor Issue: Map</p>	<p>CPUC-1309-Rpt: Numerous substantive contributions to Appendix A and Attachment 1.</p> <p>D.14-01-010: “This decision approves a work plan for the first step of a two-step process for the development of a statewide fire-threat map.”</p>	Yes
<p>6. MGRA opposed SDG&E’s attempt to open a new workshop process to review alternative work plans.</p> <p>Contributor Issue: Map</p>	<p>MGRA-1310-RCm, p. 5: “Submitting a new process and plan in the comment phase would basically reset the process stage back to where it was at the inception of the technical panel workshops, at which SDG&E tried and failed to put forward its model for map development. Their brief outline for an</p>	

	<p>Alternate Work Plan should have occurred much earlier in the process to comply with the timeline set forth in the Scoping Memo.”</p> <p>D.14-01-010, p. 22: “We decline to adopt SDG&E’s proposal to convene an all-party event where parties may present alternative work plans to the assigned Commissioner. The Track 3 Panel met over a four-month period to discuss work plans. Holding another all-party event would needlessly delay this proceeding.”</p>	Yes
<p>7. MGRA opposed the CIP coalition motion for evidentiary hearings. Contributor Issue: Map</p>	<p>MGRA-1311-REH, p. 1: “The CIP Coalition then cites to the Phase 3 workshop reports from Track 1 and Track 2. However the Scoping Memo clearly states that grounds for evidentiary hearings would exist if there are contested points of fact that arise in the course of Track 3 workshops. In fact, Rule 48 is never mentioned in the Track 3 workshop report.”</p> <p>CPUC-1311-ALJ, p.8: “Having missed that deadline, the CIP Coalition now makes a belated effort to request an evidentiary hearing on Track 1 issues by filing a motion for an evidentiary hearing on the unrelated Track 3 Report”</p> <p>p. 1: “This ruling denies the motion filed by the CIP Coalition to hold an evidentiary hearing in Phase 3, Track 3 of this proceeding.”</p>	Yes
<p>8. MGRA authored Decision language allowing Map 2 work plan to begin prior to Map 1 decision. Initiator Issue: Map</p>	<p>Joint-1401-Cmt, p.2: “In the case where there is no opposition to the Fire Map 1 Workshop Report, this work shall commence as soon as practical after the submission of the Fire Map 1 Workshop Report.”</p> <p>D.14-01-010, p. 27: “If there is no opposition to the Fire Map 1 Workshop Report, the Track 3 Technical Panel</p>	Yes

	shall convene as soon as practical after the submission of the report.”	
--	---	--

B. Duplication of Effort (§§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?¹	yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	yes	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: SED, Cal Fire, Los Angeles County, Hans Laetz. Also worked with electrical utilities and communications providers on workshop reports.		Verified
d. Describe how you coordinated with ORA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party: MGRA was an initiator of the fire hazard mapping project and initiated the original contacts between SED and Cal Fire during Phase 2. During Phase 3 it has worked closely with all parties to ensure that the Track 3 process stayed true to its original goals, and to transition the process to Cal Fire leadership. All – MGRA organized telephone conferences to discuss strategies and substantive issues. MGRA was an active participant in workshops and in product preparation, providing drafting and review of proposed work plans and schedules. SED/Cal Fire/LA County – MGRA worked in close coordination with these parties, often preparing joint filings with them. Where joint filings were not done, common issues were identified to prevent duplication of effort. Laetz – MGRA worked with Mr. Laetz, providing review and procedural advice.		Verified

C. Additional Comments on Part II:

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment	
1			Contribution Types	There are various types and levels of contribution that the Alliance interventions provided. These are defined and explained below.
			Primary	A Primary contribution is one in which the Alliance made a unique and definitive difference in supplying information not supplied by any other party. The Alliance can show that "but for" its intervention, the

¹ The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

				Decision would have likely reached a different conclusion.														
			Initiator	In instances where the Alliance was an "Initiator", it was the first to bring a particular issue or analysis to the Commission's attention. Other parties subsequently made additions or improvements that were accepted by the Commission.														
			Contributor	While not initiating an analysis or study, the Alliance made a significant contribution to it. Also, in decisions or conclusions which take into account many different factors, the Alliance's results contribute one or more of these factors.														
			Improvement	The Alliance commented on an existing process or measure and its suggestion was adopted in the final decision.														
			Complimentary	The Alliance chose a different method or analysis than that used in the Final Decision, but which is consistent with it and supports the same results.														
			Alternative	The Alliance reached a conclusion or presented an analysis at variance with the Decision or with the Final EIR/EIS, but which raised important points.														
2.	X		Abbreviations for issues that MGRA was involved in: Pr: Procedural Mp: Fire Threat Maps for Utilities Due to the highly specific nature of D.14-01-010, the only issue dealt with is the production of utility-specific fire hazard maps. Therefore all compensation requested by MGRA in this filing is due to its contribution on this particular issue. A compensation request for MGRA contributions to Track 1 and Track 2 of this proceeding will be filed separately.															
3	X		<table><tr><th>Abbreviation</th><th>Document</th></tr><tr><td>MGRA-1204-PHC</td><td>MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT FOR R.08-11-005 PHASE 3</td></tr><tr><td>CPUC-1206-Scp</td><td>ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S RULING AND SCOPING MEMO FOR PHASE 3 OF THIS PROCEEDING</td></tr><tr><td>Joint-1207-Data</td><td>Data Collection Fields (CPSD & MGRA) - <i>circulated draft</i></td></tr><tr><td>CPUC-1209-Rpt</td><td>ORDER INSTITUTING RULEMAKING 08-11-005 PHASE III – TECHNICAL PANEL 2 REPORT</td></tr><tr><td>MGRA-1210-Cmt</td><td>MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE COMMENTS ON PHASE 3 REPORTS FROM TRACK ONE AND TWO TECHNICAL PANELS FROM TRACK ONE AND TWO TECHNICAL PANELS</td></tr><tr><td>MGRA-1211-RCm</td><td>REPLY COMMENTS OF THE MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE ON PHASE 3 REPORTS FROM TRACK ONE AND TWO TECHNICAL PANELS</td></tr></table>		Abbreviation	Document	MGRA-1204-PHC	MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT FOR R.08-11-005 PHASE 3	CPUC-1206-Scp	ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S RULING AND SCOPING MEMO FOR PHASE 3 OF THIS PROCEEDING	Joint-1207-Data	Data Collection Fields (CPSD & MGRA) - <i>circulated draft</i>	CPUC-1209-Rpt	ORDER INSTITUTING RULEMAKING 08-11-005 PHASE III – TECHNICAL PANEL 2 REPORT	MGRA-1210-Cmt	MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE COMMENTS ON PHASE 3 REPORTS FROM TRACK ONE AND TWO TECHNICAL PANELS FROM TRACK ONE AND TWO TECHNICAL PANELS	MGRA-1211-RCm	REPLY COMMENTS OF THE MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE ON PHASE 3 REPORTS FROM TRACK ONE AND TWO TECHNICAL PANELS
Abbreviation	Document																	
MGRA-1204-PHC	MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT FOR R.08-11-005 PHASE 3																	
CPUC-1206-Scp	ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S RULING AND SCOPING MEMO FOR PHASE 3 OF THIS PROCEEDING																	
Joint-1207-Data	Data Collection Fields (CPSD & MGRA) - <i>circulated draft</i>																	
CPUC-1209-Rpt	ORDER INSTITUTING RULEMAKING 08-11-005 PHASE III – TECHNICAL PANEL 2 REPORT																	
MGRA-1210-Cmt	MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE COMMENTS ON PHASE 3 REPORTS FROM TRACK ONE AND TWO TECHNICAL PANELS FROM TRACK ONE AND TWO TECHNICAL PANELS																	
MGRA-1211-RCm	REPLY COMMENTS OF THE MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE ON PHASE 3 REPORTS FROM TRACK ONE AND TWO TECHNICAL PANELS																	

			MGRA-1302-Rpl	OUTLINE FOR DETERMINING WILDFIRE LOSS AVOIDANCE AS PART OF A COST/BENEFIT OR RISK/BENEFIT ANALYSIS - <i>circulated draft</i>
			Joint-1304-PHC	PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT FOR PHASE 3, TRACK 3 SUBMITTED JOINTLY BY THE SAFETY AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, AND MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE
			CPUC-1305-Scp	ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S AMENDED SCOPING MEMO AND RULING FOR TRACK 3 ISSUES AND DEFERRED TRACK 1 ISSUES
			MGRA-1306-Cmt	TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS FOR PHASE 3, TRACK 3
			MGRA-1306-RCm	TECHNICAL PANEL REPLY COMMENTS FOR PHASE 3, TRACK 3
			CPUC-1309-Rpt	PHASE 3, TRACK 3 TECHNICAL PANEL REPORT FOR WORKSHOPS HELD JUNE - SEPTEMBER 2013
			Joint-1310-Cmt	OPENING COMMENTS ON PHASE 3 TRACKS 3 TECHNICAL PANEL REPORT FOR WORKSHOPS HELD JUNE-SEPTEMBER 2013 FILED JOINTLY BY THE SAFETY AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION, MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE, AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
			MGRA-1310-RCm	MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE REPLY COMMENTS FOR JUNE - SEPTEMBER 2013 WORKSHOP REPORT PHASE 3, TRACK 3
			MGRA-1311-REH	MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE RESPONSE TO THE MOTION OF THE CIP COALITION FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARINGS
			CPUC-1311-PD	DECISION ADOPTING REGULATIONS TO REDUCE THE FIRE HAZARDS ASSOCIATED WITH OVERHEAD ELECTRIC UTILITY FACILITIES AND AERIAL COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES
			CPUC-1311-ALJ	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING DENYING MOTION FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON PHASE 3, TRACK 3 ISSUES
			CPUC-1312-PD	DECISION APPROVING THE WORK PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF FIRE MAP 1
			MGRA-1312-Cmt	MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE COMMENTS ON PHASE 3 TRACK 1 and TRACK 2 DRAFT DECISION

			Joint-1401-Cmt	COMMENTS OF THE SAFETY AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION, LOS ANGELES COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT, AND THE MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE ON PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER FLORIO APPROVING WORK PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF FIRE MAP 1	
			MGRA-1401-RCm	MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE REPLY TO COMMENTS ON PHASE 3 TRACK 1 and TRACK 2 PROPOSED DECISION	
			D.14-01-010	DECISION APPROVING THE WORK PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF FIRE MAP 1	
			D.14-02-015	DECISION ADOPTING REGULATIONS TO REDUCE THE FIRE HAZARDS ASSOCIATED WITH OVERHEAD ELECTRIC UTILITY FACILITIES AND AERIAL COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES	

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):

a. Intervenor's Claim of Cost Reasonableness	CPUC Verified
<p>D.14-01-010, p. 1: "In October 2007, devastating wildfires driven by strong Santa Ana winds burned hundreds of square miles in Southern California. Several of the worst wildfires were reportedly ignited by overhead power lines and aerial communications facilities in close proximity to power lines."</p> <p>Additionally, testimony in other proceedings has shown that property damage from power line fires in 2007 was in excess of \$2 B. While extreme weather of this type might possibly be expected only every few decades (undisputed MGRA testimony in A.09-08-021, p. 11, suggests a range between 20 and 200 years assuming historical weather will match future weather), unless the power line fire threat is addressed the public remains exposed to extensive losses. If we amortize such losses over time, for example, and were to assume a \$2 B loss occurs every 50 years, this would be equivalent to an average cost to ratepayers of \$40 M / year.</p> <p>MGRA's proposed rules and other activities in this proceeding were designed to reduce this fire threat by ensuring that utilities are guided by scientifically sound maps that identify hazard areas. These initiatives are a critical part of longer term reduction of utility fire risks to an acceptable level.</p> <p>Even if the fractional risk reduction due to the adoption of the Commission's decision was small, the savings to ratepayers (not only economic, but in risks to their lives and well-being), would dwarf the amount of intervenor compensation being sought by the Alliance.</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</p> <p>The majority of the MGRA input was technical, and was prepared by MGRA expert witness Dr. Mitchell.</p> <p>Ms. Conklin worked on revisions and communications with other parties. Ms Conklin is not requesting intervenor compensation for this portion of this proceeding, but wishes to preserve the right to compensation in future portions of this proceeding.</p> <p>Not all analysis prepared by Dr. Mitchell was used in the proceeding. No compensation is requested for unused work.</p> <p>Additionally, there are specific meetings by phone bridge attended by Dr. Mitchell for which no compensation is requested.</p> <p>Due to the length of and number of workshops comprising this proceeding, it was necessary for Dr. Mitchell to make a number of trips to San Francisco. We attended by phone bridge when possible and appropriate.</p>	Verified
<p>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</p> <p>Decision 14-01-010 was narrowly focused on the issue of fire hazard map creation. Therefore, MGRA only claims fees and expenses for work related to the issues of fire hazard map creation. Work on other issues will be claimed in a separate application.</p> <p>Map: 107.45 hours</p>	Verified

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Mitchell	2012	8.4	\$270	D.13-02-012	\$2,268.00	8.4	\$275.00 ²	\$2,310.00
Mitchell	2013	59.05	\$275	D.13-02-012, ALJ-287	\$16,238.75	58.05 ^[A]	\$280.00 ³	\$16,254.00
Subtotal: \$18,506.75						Subtotal: \$18,564.00		
OTHER FEES:								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Mitchell	2012	8	\$135	D.13-02-012	\$1,080.00	8	\$137.50	\$1,100.00
Mitchell	2013	32	\$137.50	D.13-02-012, ALJ-287	\$4,400.00	32	\$140.00	\$4,480.00
Subtotal: \$5,480.00						Subtotal: \$5,580.00		

² Approved in D.13-10-038.

³ Application of 2.0% Cost-of-Living Adjustment approved in ALJ-287.

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Mitchell	2014	8.5	\$137.50	D.13-02-012, ALJ-287	\$1,168.75	8.5	\$140.00	\$1,190.00
Subtotal: \$1,168.75						Subtotal: \$1,190.00		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail		Amount	Amount			
1	Travel	See Part III.C, Comment #4, and associated attachment. All expenses were associated with the fire hazard mapping issue (“Map”)		\$2,747.17	\$2,746.17 ^[B]			
TOTAL REQUEST: \$27,902.67						TOTAL AWARD: \$28,080.17		
<p>* We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate.</p>								

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	<p>Attachment 2 - R.08-11-005 MGRA_R08P3T12_IC_Mitchell.pdf Time sheets for Dr. Mitchell.</p> <p>The 2012 rate specified for Dr. Mitchell for the second phase of this proceeding was \$270/hr (D.13-02-012, p. 20).</p> <p>The following adjustments are authorized in ALJ-287: COLA of 2%</p> <p>The rate requested for 2013-2014 is then \$275/hr</p> <p>Billing tiers in this time sheet are as follows: Tier 0 - Unbilled time Tier 1 - Travel, Intervenor Compensation (1/2 expert rate) Tier 2 - Review/researching/revisions (full expert rate)</p>

	Tier 3 - Authoring, analysis (full expert rate)
3	Diane Conklin actively participated in this proceeding but declines to request intervenor compensation for this portion of it. MGRA wishes to preserve all rights for Diane Conklin to request intervenor compensation in this and all future proceedings in which she makes substantive contribution, and to be eligible for previously established intervenor compensation rates which have been approved by the Commission for her, including applicable adjustments.
4	See Attachment #3 - R.08-11-005 MGRA_R08P3_Expenses_IC_P3.pdf for a list of all expenses. Requested expenses include all travel costs for two pre-hearing conferences and three workshops. Due to the narrow focus of decision 14-01-010, only expenses associated with the issue of fire hazard mapping ("Map") have been claimed. Expenses associated with other issues will be requested in forthcoming claims.
5	See Attachment #4 - R.08-11-005 MGRA_R08P3T12-Receipts.pdf for all receipts for costs included in the expense claim.

D. CPUC Disallowances and Comments:

Item	Reason
A	Reduction of one hour for advice provided to Hans Laetz. Advice provided to Laetz was not substantive, and the motion was denied on January 12, 2015.
B	Reduction of one dollar for donation to Make A Wish Foundation. The receipt for a stay at the Hotel Petite Auberge on 4/22/2012 includes a donation to the Make A Wish Foundation. This charitable donation is not eligible for compensation.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(2)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Mussey Grade Road Alliance has made a substantial contribution to D.14-10-010.
2. The requested hourly rates for Mussey Grade Road Alliance's representatives are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.

3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$28,080.17.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Mussey Grade Road Alliance is awarded \$28,080.17.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, the Commission's Intervenor Compensation Fund shall pay Mussey Grade Road Alliance the total award. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning June 2, 2014, the 75th day after the filing of Mussey Grade Road Alliance's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	
Contribution Decision(s):	D1401010		
Proceeding(s):	R0811005		
Author:	ALJ Kenney		
Payer(s):	Commission's Intervenor Compensation Fund		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Mussey Grade Road Alliance	3/19/2014	\$27,902.67	\$28,080.17	No	Reduction for non-substantial contribution and non-reimbursable expense claim. Increase for higher hourly rate than requested.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Joseph	Mitchell	Expert	Mussey Grade Road Alliance	\$270.00	2012	\$275.00
Joseph	Mitchell	Expert	Mussey Grade Road Alliance	\$275.00	2013	\$280.00

(END OF APPENDIX)